ciplinary action. Rule 30-A lays down special procedure for certain categories of cases and this rule can be invoked in specified circumstances, namely (i) when a post held by an employee is abolished; (ii) an employee is declared unfit on medical grounds for the service of the company; and (iii) an employee remains on unauthorised absence for 30 days or more. A decision under rule 30-A is taken at the level of C&MD after scrutiny of each case by a Screening Committee and for reasons to be recorded in writing. While disciplinary action can also be taken under Rule 25 of the IDPL CDA Rules, for all acts of misconduct, Rule 30-A has application in specific circumstances. As reported by IDPL, action under Rule 30-A has been sparingly applied only in respect of 8 employees and the final disciplinary action was taken only in respect of two cases. The selective and discretionary approach in application of the rule rests solely with the highest authority in the company who is expected to act rationally and judiciously and each such case is decided after a scrutiny of a Screening Committee of two senior officers and for reasons to be recorded in writing.

(b) In view of reply to (a) above, it is clear that no disciplinary action is taken under Rule 5 (7). Therefore, the question of switching over from Rule 5 (7) to Rule 30-A or simultaneously proceeding under the two rules do not arise.

(c) and (d) Is view on reply to (b) the questions do not arise.

Names of Two Terminated Employees

4598. SHRI SUNIL BASU RAY: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1148 given in the Rajya Sabha on 7th May, 1992 and state:

(a) what are the reasons and names of two permanent employees of IDPL who were terminated under rule 30-A and from which date their termination became effective;

(b) whether it is a fact that both these employees were on unauthorised absence since 15th June, 1989 and 12th March, 1989 respectively when only rule 5 (7) read with rule 25 was existing in IDPL CDA rules;

(c) if so, the misconduct which was detected after four days as per rule 5 (7), then within how much time charge sheets were issued to both of them under rule 25 for disciplinary action;

(d) whether it is a fact that management of IDPL took almost eight months in one case to issue a charge sheet for unauthorised absence on 17th November, 1989 under rule 25 and after six months repeated the same identical charge sheet, because of its patent irregularity, on 21st May, 1990 undes rule 25 the later under the signature of C&MD;

(e) whether it is a fact that within ten days, after the second charge sheet, i.e. 1st June, 1990 a show cause notice was issued for the same offence, this time under rule 30-A, in the above case; and

(f) if so, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) As reported by IDPL, services of Shri R. K. Shewramani, Medical Representative and Shri Kamal Bhasin, Marketing Executive were terminated with effect from 8-1-1991 and 12.3.1991 respectively. The reasons for termination of their services was continued defiance of the orders of the company. In the case of Shri Bhasin, he was transferred from Delhi to Gurgaon which even did not involve change in residence as Gurgaon is a part of the Delhi agglomeration. Shri Bhasin did not report at Gurgaon in compliance of the orders of the Management and

refused to comply with the orders. Shri Shewramani also did not comply with the transfer orders and declared himself to be on indefinite strike.

(b) Yes, Sir. However, Shri Shewramani was on unauthorised absence with effect from 20.6.1989 and not from 15.6.1989.

(c) Charge-sheet was issued to Kamal Bhasin on 17.11.1989 and on 12.12.1989 to Shri R. K. Shewramani.

(d) Yes, Sir.

(e) and (f) It is a fact that a Show Cause Notice was issued on 1.6.1990 unler Rule 30-A. However, the charges listed in this Show Cause Notice were not exactly same as those listed in the charge-sheet dated 21.5.1990. In the show cause notice dated 1.6.1990, action was proposed to be taken solely on the ground of unauthorised absence from duty for more than 30 days. The charge-sheet dated 21.5.1990 had emphasis more on use of intemperate language, insubordination etc. Hence, the charges were not identical in the charge-sheet and the show cause notice.

Grants to fertilizer industry co-ordination committee

4599. SHRI S. K. T. RAMACHANDRAN: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) what is the estimated annual reuqirement of grants to the Fertilizer Industry Co-ordination Committee for the year 1992-93 in regard to fertilizer subsidy payments;

(b) whether so far, the estimated requirement of funds, as to subsidy payments was available from the Government to FICC from April to July;

(c) what was the monthly estimated requirement during this period and what amount was made available to the FICC; and

(d) whether there is any constraint in the availabiity of this requirement?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) An amount of Rs. 6272 crores has been estimated as the requirement for subsidy payments, including the carried over balance of the previous year, during the year 1992-93 in respect of indigenous fertilizers.

(b) An amount of Rs. 950 crores has been released by the Government to the FICC for the first quarter (April to June, 1992) and Rs. 1300 crores for the second quarter (July to September, 1992) for the payment of fertilizer subsidy.

(c) The monthly estimated requirement of funds for payment of current fertilizer subsidy during the year 1992-93 comes to Rs. 406 crores on an average. An amount of Rs. 2250 crores has been released for the first six months for payment of current subsidy as well as carry over from the previous year.

(d) Yes, Sir.

Narwapahar Turamdih Project

4600. MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Newspaper Turamdih Project of the Union Carbide India Limited was approved in April, 1989;

(b) if so, whether the Proejct has since become operational; and

(c) if not, what are the reasons for the delay in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRONICS AND DEPARTMENT OF OCEAN DEVELOPMENT AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINIS-